

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS***Brief Summary of Status***

Claims 1-58 are pending in the application.

Claims 16-26 are allowed.

Claims 1-15 and 27-49 are rejected.

Claims Objections

In the above-referenced office action, the Examiner asserts the following:

“2. Claims 1-58 are objected to because of the following informalities:

With regard to claims 1-58, Examiner suggests introducing the material subject matter first and then following by its respective abbreviation in parenthesis because limitations within parentheses are not part of the claim.

With regard to claim 1, Examiner suggests replacing “the DEVs” in line 16 with “the plurality of DEVs” in consistent with the claim language.

With regard to claim 2, Examiner suggests replacing “the DEVs in line 8 with “the plurality of DEVs” in consistent with the claim language.

Appropriate correction is required.” (office action, Part of Paper No./Mail Date 20080829, p. 2)

The Applicant has amended certain of the claims.

As such, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw these objections.

35 U.S.C. § 112

In the above-referenced office action, the Examiner asserts the following:

“4. **Claims 1-15, 27-49** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.” (office action, Part of Paper No./Mail Date 20080829, p. 4)

The Applicant has amended certain of the claims.

With respect to independent claim 1, for each DEV, the round trip time is of the respective transmitted UWB pulse (e.g., the one transmitted from the PNC to that DEV) and the at least one additional respective received time duration of a respective received UWB pulse (e.g., the UWB pulse transmitted back to the PNC from that particular DEV).

With respect to dependent claim 2, a PNC stands for a piconet coordinator. The PNC is a first PNC means the piconet coordinator (e.g., of independent claim 1) is a first piconet coordinator. The second piconet includes a second PNC (i.e., a second piconet coordinator).

With respect to dependent claim 5, there is a corresponding profile for each group (e.g., in independent claim 1), and there is therefore multiple profiles (i.e., one for each group thereby forming a plurality of profiles).

With respect to dependent claim 6, the Applicant claims subject matter including a first group of the at least two groups includes DEVs of the plurality of DEVs that are relatively closer to the PNC than DEVs of the plurality of DEVs that are in a second group. The “relatively closer” is in comparison to the closeness of the DEVs in the first group to the PNC with respect to the closeness of the DEVs in the second group to the PNC.

With respect to dependent claim 11, the “relative position” is of the at least one DEV with respect to the PNC. For example, a relative position of a first device with respect to a second device is based on the location on the first device (e.g., “with respect to the PNC”).

With respect to dependent claim 11, there is a first group of DEVs and a second group of DEVs.

The Applicant has amended dependent claims 14 and 15.

The comments provided above are also analogously applicable to independent

The Applicant has also amended independent claim 27 and dependent claims 30, 32, 33, 37, and 38.

The Applicant has also amended independent claim 39 and dependent claims 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, and 48.

In view of at least these comments and amendments provided above, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw these rejections.

Allowable Subject Matter

In the above-referenced office action, the Examiner asserts the following:

“6. **Claims 16-26, 50-58** are allowed.” (office action, Part of Paper No./Mail
Date 20080829, p. 5)

The Applicant respectfully believes that claims 1-58 are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests that they be passed to allowance.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone or facsimile if the Examiner believes that such a communication would advance the prosecution of the present U.S. utility patent application.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,
By: /SXShort/ Reg. No. 45,105
Shayne X. Short, Ph.D., Reg. No. 45,105
Direct Phone: (512) 825-1145
Direct Fax No. (888) 456-7824

GARLICK HARRISON & MARKISON
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
P.O. Box 160727
AUSTIN, TEXAS 78716-0727
TELEPHONE (512) 825-1145 / FACSIMILE (888) 456-7824 or (888) 711-8305